

DRAFT – DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE

Q&A's for Bayview Hunters Pt Mtg - Press

Q. I'm from the press, and I have questions.

A. This is a public meeting and therefore open to anyone to attend. The purpose of this meeting, however, is to hear from community residents about their technical assistance needs. Out of respect for the participants who came here for that purpose, we'd like to make sure that we hear from community residents tonight. Tomorrow morning, please call our Press Officer Suzanne Skadowski, and she'll be happy to set up a time when we can focus on your questions.

Q. I want to videotape this meeting

A. The purpose of this meeting is to hear from community residents about their technical assistance needs. Out of respect for the participants who came here for that purpose, I'd like to ask them if they feel comfortable being on camera. If they agree, then you can videotape.

Q. Tetra Tech contractors falsified radiation data. How can you trust anything they tell you?

A. Tetra Tech managers and staff have taken a number of actions to address the situation. They have reviewed 70,000 samples going back to 2005 to look for any signs of similar problems. Where they saw potential issues, they resampled. They have put in new procedures to prevent this problem from happening again. For example, they have retrained staff and increased scrutiny in the field.

Q. How can we trust that the cleanup is protective?

A. Cleanup decisions are only being made using the data that has been either reviewed or resampled. In addition, two independent methods of monitoring radiation are in place. The State Department of Public Health takes the Navy's samples and takes confirmation samples and uses its independent laboratory to test radiation samples to confirm the protectiveness of the cleanup. In addition, trucks go through a radiation screening portal before they can leave the Base. If the levels of radiation are high enough to trigger an alarm, then they must go back.

Q. Didn't Tetra Tech send radioactive soil to the wrong landfill in Pittsburgh?

A. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission oversees the licensing of radiation cleanup service providers. It inspected Hunters Point last spring and this summer to review Tetra Tech's practices. The NRC inspector did not find concerns regarding soil shipped to an inappropriate facility. [Need to work with NRC on the best language to use] For more information related to Tetra Tech's license, contact Richard Chang at 301-415-5563. [Lily left msg w/Richard confirming if he's the appropriate contact]

Q. Will EPA punish Tetra Tech and the Navy?

A. As you can see from the public Tetra Tech investigation report, Tetra Tech has already fired 3 employees and docked a month's pay from two supervisors. EPA's focus is on compliance and making sure that the cleanup is protective. Based on our discussions with the Navy and our

Commented [SS1]: Do we agree that they "falsified" data? Or do we think they made inadvertent mistakes in sampling and/or recordkeeping? If the latter, then we want to state that TT and Navy found, reported, and corrected the errors. We don't want to accept a false assumption, not even implicitly.

Commented [SS2]: Should we state that EPA trusts our rigorous oversight and review process, that we do trust the Navy's rigorous oversight and review. They found the errors/mistakes, reported them, and corrected them. We trust this process. Again, we don't want to implicitly accept a false assumption.

Commented [SS3]: See above comment. We should explicitly state that we trust our rigorous and careful process. We make safe, conservative, careful cleanup decisions.

Commented [SS4]: This statement refers to the cleanup activities, not the final protectiveness of the cleanup decisions. Might be helpful to state the safety measures of the cleanup activities are protective AND our cleanup decisions, what the site will be at the end, will be protective.

Commented [SS5]: If this comes up, is the question confusing the sampling problems with the lead soil disposal problem? If so, our response should clarify that there was a sampling/recordkeeping problem with radioactive sampling, but in the case of soil disposal, the issue was lead-contaminated soil delivered to the wrong landfill. Correct?

Commented [SS6]: TT is the Navy's contractor. EPA's oversight role is with the Navy.

review of the report Tetra Tech submitted to the Navy, the Navy and their contractor Tetra Tech ~~are~~is taking effective action to make sure this problem does not happen again. We are asking ~~some more follow-up questions~~ still evaluating the situation.

Q. Since we can't trust these contractors, have they let through radioactive dust contaminating our neighborhood?

Commented [S57]: See above comments on "trust." We trust our careful and rigorous review and oversight process. The Navy also has a careful and rigorous review process.

Commented [S58]: Is this another false assumption? Is there evidence of this?

A. We have heard that the community has concerns about dust. In response, EPA has recently begun doing unannounced inspections in addition to the routine inspections we have been doing with other agencies for years. We are now working together with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) inspectors to monitor dust and truck traffic across the board, not just radioactive waste. The Navy has recently implemented new protections to better control dust and to ensure trucks carrying any materials are covered. The Navy has increased internal checks, bought better sweeping equipment, improved coordination among contractors, and increased contract requirements to ensure dust control.

Commented [S59]: Are they all new protections, or are they increased, or strengthened measures to improve dust control? This makes it sound like they had no dust control before.

Q. Will EPA fire Tetra Tech? Why did Tetra Tech get this contract again? Isn't that rewarding bad behavior?

A. EPA has a federal oversight relationship with the Navy for this cleanup. Tetra Tech is a contractor for the Navy, and it is the Navy's responsibility to manage its contractors through which has its own contracting process. This includes an evaluation process. I suggest that you contact the Navy directly to address this internal procedure. Please call Thomas Macchiarella at 619-532-0987.

Draft Talking points about lead contaminated soil that went to the wrong landfill

What happened?

- The Navy hired Arcadis to transport waste from Hunters Point for the year. In June, 2014, Arcadis took lead-containing soil to the Keller Canyon landfill, which normally should only accept non-hazardous waste. The levels of lead ~~are~~would be considered hazardous waste by the state's standards, but ~~the lead levels are~~it would not be considered hazardous waste by EPA's standards.
- Arcadis discovered the problem a few days later and reported it to the Navy and the landfill management immediately. The landfill immediately notified the county department that oversees implements the landfill its permit from CalRecycle. The landfill also safely contained the soil and restricted access to protect workers and the public.
- One week later, Arcadis moved the soil to an appropriate hazardous waste landfill at Buttonwillow. It also removed and safely disposed of the soil under that pile at Keller Canyon to a depth of 1 foot ~~from Keller Canyon~~ and did confirmation sampling to make sure no lead-contaminated soil was left behind.

EPA's role

- Though the soil was not considered hazardous by EPA standards, EPA stayed in close touch contact with the Navy on this issue to confirm that:
 -
 - o 1 -- there was no human or environmental exposure to this lead-containing soil;-- Arcadis covered the trucks when they transported the soil. They use the same procedures to secure the soil during transport whether it is considered hazardous or not. The landfill placed the contaminated soil in a remote part of its operation and did not move it after initial placement.
 - o 2 -- the contractor's procedures are improved to prevent future reoccurrence;-- Arcadis has done a root cause analysis and implemented additional checks in its standard operating procedures to prevent the same mistake from happening again.
 - o 3 -- EPA's or the Navy's reviewsStudies have confirmed that no similar incident occurred before;-- Arcadis has also checked all the soil it has transported from Hunters Point during its entire contract period and has not discovered any similar issues
- Once Arcadis has finalized its report, the Navy will provide it to EPA for further review.

Let me know if you want to meet again so I can refresh your memory on the details in case you get questions. Also let me know if you want any more formal writeup.

Commented [SS10]: Lily – If my comments are off-base or confused, then please let me know and we can talk through this.